REMARKS

Claims 4, 5, 11, and 12 have been canceled without prejudice to further prosecution. Claims 1, 6, 10, 13, and 14 have been amended. No new subject matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the following remarks. Claims 1-3, 6-10, and 13-25 are pending.

General Remarks:

1) A communication session between a node A and a node B comprises in general a phase during which signalling data packets are exchanged during the two nodes to set up a connection and a phase during which user data packets are exchanged via the connection. A binding update is an example of a signalling data packet. The "packets" to which the application refers in, for instance, [0032] are user data packets. The same goes for the "packets" to which Soliman et al. refers on page 25, last paragraph, first sentence. It should be noted that there is a difference between signalling packets and user data packets. The invention disclosed in the application relates in particular to scenarios involving the transmission of user data packets (see [0032]).

2) A "downlink user data packet" is user data packet routed from a correspondent node to a mobile node, an "uplink packet" is a user data packet routed from a mobile node to a correspondent node.

Discussion of Rejected Claims

Claims 1-3, 9, 14-16, 18-22, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as being anticipated by Soliman *et al.* ("Hierarchical Mobile IPv6 mobility management (HMIPv6)"). In addition, Claims 4-8, 10-13, 17, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as being unpatentable over Soliman in view of one or more of Aura (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2005/0041634) and Jung (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0015396). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not individually or collectively disclose the combination of elements recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 14, as amended.

For example, Claims 1, 10 and 14 all recite "session packets" which are "user data packets". These "session packets" are routed from the routed from the correspondent node to the mobile node and are thus downlink user data packets. For some part of the route, namely from

the correspondent node to, what is phrased in claims 1, 10 and 14, "the network entity", these downlink user data packets are tunnelled.

Soliman et al. page 25, last paragraph mentions that "The MAP [Mobility Anchor Point, which could correspond with "network entity" in claims 1, 10 and 14] MUST be able to accept packets [note: user data packets, see above under "General remarks", 1)] tunnelled from the mobile node, with the mobile node being the tunnel entry point and the MAP being the tunnel exit point." In other words, Soliman et al. discloses a tunnel which extends from the mobile node (entry point) to the MAP (exit point). The user data packets traversing such a tunnel are uplink user data packets. Soliman et al. does not disclose any other tunnels.

Thus there are at least three differences between Soliman et al. and claims 1, 10 and 14, namely the direction which the user data packets have and the location of the tunnel. These differences are summarized in the table below:

	Direction user data Packets	Tunnel between mobile node and network entity?	Tunnel between network entity and correspondent node?
Soliman et al.	Uplink	Yes	No
Claims 1, 10 and 14	Downlink	No	Yes

Aura, see [0026], relates to "packets sent by the correspondent node": to downlink packets. Thus there is no incentive to combine the teachings from Soliman and Aura as relating to different types of packets (Soliman: "uplink", Aura: "downlink"). In addition, Aura deals with security problems relating to the transmission of "false binding updates", (and therefore, not to user data packets) sent by a "malicious node", see [0027]. The invention disclosed in the application does not relate to security problems. This is another indication that goes against combining Soliman with Aura.

Jung relates to "normal" IPv4 mobile IP operation. In such a case there is a network entity called a foreign agent where a tunnel extending from the home agent (entry point) to this foreign agent ends (exit point), see Jung figure 3, reference 320 and [0032]. It is also possible to have a

tunnel from the correspondent node directly to the foreign agent, see Jung figure 4, arrows between references 10 and 30 and [0035]. The invention disclosed in the application applies also to IPv6. As the skilled person will know, there are no foreign agents in IPv6 so Jung cannot be relevant.

Accordingly, at least for these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 10 and 14 overcome the cited prior art and are, therefore, in condition for allowance. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are in condition for allowance at least because of the features they include form the independent claims from which they depend and because of their own features.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: January 27, 2011   By: / Phillip Bennett /
                                                Phillip Bennett
                                                Registration No. 60,624
                                                Attorney of Record
                                                Customer No. 20,995
                                                (858) 836-9000

10417838_1
012711